

Remarks/Arguments

Responsive to the office action, Applicant respectfully offers the following comments and arguments. In previous communications of this patent application the Applicant as described the nature and the uniqueness of the invention.

Claim rejections under 35 USC 103:

All Claims 17-29 were rejected as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,151,680 (Kim) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,560,499 (Demmer). Kim presents a computer system, which is installable on individual computers and not accessible on the Web, to perform concrete pipe design calculations using an existing design method. As such the design method is not new, and further the computer system itself will not yield a different design outcome. The Examiner refers to Demmer teaching an integrated engineering design and management system that allows for material procurement based on engineering design input (column 16, lines 10-32). Upon careful examination of the patent, it is clear that the integration that is referred to is the assembly of various sequential or serial and common work flow processes into a system. Moreover, Demmer's computer based system only mentions the possibility of coordinating the procurement of materials with respect to overall project scheduling, and as such is not related to design of the an particular equipment. Neither Kim nor Demmer teach the possibility of using and integrating market data in the design process itself so that the design results are different and optimized for specified commercial parameters. The present invention offers integration of market data that is

gathered in the procurement modules with the design calculations for optimized design, selecting the product for procurement, and then entering the procurement system for approvals and purchase.

The Applicant respectfully submits that

1. there is lack of teaching in Kim (in view of Demmer) of specifying commercial parameters set forth in fourth and fifth modules called for in Claim 17 of the present application;
2. there is lack of teaching in Kim (in view of Demmer) of performing design calculations using different methods including probability distribution based parameters and integrating probability distributions of market data put forth in Claim 25 b & c;
3. there is lack of teaching in Kim (in view of Demmer) of commercial and product optimization parameters set forth in Claim 25 d; and
4. there is lack of teaching in Kim (in view of Demmer) of comparing product design results and product parameters, which have influenced the design and establish the set of products for any given optimization parameter, set forth in Claim 25 g.

Applicant requests consideration for allowance of Claims 17 through 29 which are believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art of record in this application. An early and favorable action on the merits of Claims 17 through 29 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/1/05


Dr. Srinivas Bette

5856 Bridle Bend Ct.
Plano, TX 75093
972-608-9919
214-454-4816